REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1-2, 4-7, 10-11 and 13-15 are amended and claims 23-27 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Various amendments are made to the claims for clarity and are unrelated to issues of patentability.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 13 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent 6,029,065 to Shah in view of WO 98/38820 to Hansson. The Office Action also rejects claims 2-7, 11-12, 14 and 20-22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Shah in view of Hansson and U.S. Patent 6,308,061 to Criss et al. (hereafter Criss). Still further, the Office Action rejects claims 8-10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Shah, in view of Hansson, Criss and U.S. Patent 5,210,751 to Onoe et al. (hereafter Onoe). The Office Action also rejects claims 16-19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Shah, Hansson and Onoe. The rejections are respectfully traversed with respect to the pending claims.

Independent claim 1 recites communicating a request for a download operation from a base station controller to a base station, and downloading the information to a plurality of mobile stations all together through a paging channel based on the request from the base station controller, the plurality of mobile stations storing the information. Independent claim 1 also recites resetting the plurality of mobile stations using the stored information and reporting a downloading result from each of the plurality of mobile stations to the base station.

The applied references do not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 1. More specifically, the Office Action (on page 2) states that Shah does not disclose communicating a request for a download operation from a base station controller to a base

station. Therefore, Shah also does not teach or suggest downloading information to a plurality of

mobile stations all together through a paging channel based on a request from a base station

controller.

Additionally, Shah discloses that a mobile station may have to select a desired feature

upon entering a visitor network such that the mobile station may utilize new features. These

features may be updated when the mobile station moves to new network. Shah does not teach or

suggest downloading information to a plurality of mobile stations all together. Hansson also does

not teach or suggest the missing feature.

When discussing features of previous dependent claim 2, the Office Action (on page 4)

cites Criss' col. 21, lines 23-34 and col. 11, lines 46-64 as relating to a plurality of mobile

terminals. However, the cited sections do not relate to downloading information to a plurality of

mobile stations all together through a paging channel based on a request from the base station

controller. Rather, as set forth in col. 11, line 54-col. 13, line 54, various events occur at a mobile

terminal 36 during a boot-up initialization routine. This includes transmitting a BOOTp request

packet to a host computer 30 and subsequent transmissions back and forth between the mobile

terminal 36 and the host computer 30. See, for example, FIGs. 7a-7e. See also col. 12, line 63-

col. 13, line 15 relating to a comparison of whether the software stored in the mobile terminal 36

is the same as the latest version at an FTP server 31. These features clearly do not relate to

downloading information based on a request from a base station controller.

Further, the cited sections of Criss' col. 11, lines 46-52 does not relate to downloading

information to a plurality of mobile stations all together. Further the cited sections of Criss do

not relate to downloading information through a paging channel and/or based on a request from the base station controller. That is, with respect to Criss' col. 11, line 54-col. 13, line 53, downloading of information does not occur for a plurality of mobile stations all together based on a request from a base station controller. Thus, Criss does not teach or suggest the features of independent claim 1 missing from Shah and/or Hansson.

Furthermore, there is not suggestion of how Shah may be modified based on Criss so as to relate to a plurality of mobile stations. Criss does not relate to downloading information through a paging channel (or based on a request from a base station controller). Further, Shah does not relate to downloading information based on a request from the base station controller (or downloading for a plurality of stations all together through a paging channel). Rather, as discussed above, Shah downloads features upon entering a new network. There is no suggestion how Shah's type of disclosed communication may be modified based on Criss' disclosure so as to teach downloading information to a plurality of mobile stations all together through a paging channel based on a request from a base station controller.

For at least the reasons set forth above, the applied references do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 1. Thus, independent claim 1 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 15 recites communicating data messages from a common terminal to distributed terminals all together, and storing the data messages in each of the distributed terminals. Independent claim 15 also recites resetting an operation of the distributed terminals

based on the stored data messages, wherein the common terminal communicates each of the data messages to all of the distributed terminals all together through a paging channel.

For at least similar reasons as set forth above, the applied references do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 15. Still further, the Office Action (on page 3) appears to cite Hansson's page 2, line 29-page 3, line 2 and page 3, lines 20-22 as disclosing communicating data messages from a common terminal to distributed terminals. However, Hansson does not teach or suggest communicating data messages from a common terminal to distributed terminals all together. Thus, the applied references do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 15. Thus, independent claim 15 defines patentable subject matter.

Accordingly, each of independent claims 1 and 15 defines patentable subject matter. Each of the dependent claims depends from one of the independent claims and therefore defines patentable subject matter at least for this reason. In addition, the dependent claims recite features that further and independently distinguish over the applied references.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-22 are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

<div align="right">

Respectfully submitted,
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP

David C. Oren
Registration No. 38,694

</div>

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3777 DCO/kah
Date: August 13, 2007
Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610